IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of	) Confirmation No.: 5403
	)
Sathyanarayana Nagendra Puttu et al.	)
	) Group Art Unit: 2194
Application No.: 10/674,577	)
	)
Filed: September 29, 2003	) Examiner: Charles E. Anya
	)
For: VERIFIYING INFORMATION STORED	)
ON A MANAGED NETWORK DEVICE	)

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

In reply to the Final Office Action mailed May 2, 2007, the shortened statutory period for which runs until August 2, 2007, please reconsider the subject application in light of the remarks herein.

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. No claims have been amended, added, or cancelled. Hence, Claims 1-88 are pending in this application. All issues raised in the Office Action mailed May 2, 2007 are addressed hereinafter.

I. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement with references on March 22, 2004, but has not received an initialed copy of Form PTO-1449 indicating that the references were considered. Attached is a duplicate copy of the IDS with proof of filing by mail, in the form of a certificate of mailing, and proof of receipt by the USPTO, in the form of a copy of a postcard

receipt received by Applicant's representative and bearing a date stamp of the Office of Initial

Patent Examination (OIPE). Applicant respectfully requests the Office to return an initialed

copy of the Form PTO-1449 with the next Office communication.

II. ISSUES RELATING TO THE CITED ART

Each of the pending claims recites at least one element that is not disclosed, taught, or

suggested by the cited art, either individually or in combination. The rejections are respectfully

traversed.

A. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No.

5,737,518, issued to Grover et al. (hereinafter "*Grover*").

Claim 1 features:

> **receiving a management request containing one or more values comprising**
> > **proposals for a correct value of a managed object of the managed device;**
> **wherein the management request requests a determination as to whether any of the**
> > **one or more values match the correct value of the managed object of the**
> > **managed device;**
> **determining whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the**
> > **managed object; and**
> completing execution of the management request by:
> transmitting a notification message indicating whether any of the one or more values
> > match the correct value of the managed object.

(Emphasis added.) At least the above-bolded features of Claim 1 are not disclosed, taught, or

suggested by *Grover*.

The approach of Claim 1

In the embodiment recited by Claim 1, a managing device requests a determination as to

whether one or more given proposals for the correct value of a managed object in a managed

device match the correct values of the managed object. Rather than retrieving an attribute of the object to be tested and generating a test signal as a function of that attribute, the managing system transmits a request containing proposals for the correct value of a managed object in a managed device. A determination is then made as to whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the managed object. Finally, a notification message is sent back to the managing device indicating whether any of the values matched the correct value of the managed object.

The approach of *Grover*

Grover discloses sharply contrasting subject matter than that recited by the claimed approach, as *Grover* has no description of sending or receiving a management request comprising proposed values for an object. *Grover* does not suggest a method of proposing a distinct value for an object and requesting a determination as to whether any of the proposals match the correct value of the managed object in the managed device. Instead, the cited approach of *Grover* states that an attribute of the object is retrieved from the object management system itself or from a structure which contains the names of the objects in the object management structure and a test signal for the attribute is generated as a function of that retrieved attribute (*Grover*, Col. 3 Ln. 12-25). In this fashion, *Grover* can retrieve each and every object in the object management system and test them, or a user can specify a certain type of object to test and that object would be retrieved and tested (*Grover*, Col. 3 Ln. 35-53). *Grover* does not teach or suggest a method of proposing and verifying whether the proposed values match the value of the managed object without having to retrieve the attribute of the managed object first. Grover merely uses conventional SNMP object queries.

Distinguishing Claim 1 and the Cited Art

For claim 1, the Office Action at Col. 1 Ln. 31-44, Col. 3 Ln. 21-35, Col. 6 Ln. 30-34, and Col. 7 Ln. 57-63, contends that *Grover* shows the feature of receiving a management request containing values comprising proposals for a correct value of a managed object. The Office Action's analysis is not entirely accurate. With the claimed approach, the managing device sends a request to determine whether one or more proposed values match the value of the managed object in the managed device. *Grover*, on the other hand, at Col. 3 Ln. 20-24 and Col. 7 Ln. 57-60, describes conventional SNMP processing in which an attribute is retrieved and simply queried or modified as a function of that retrieved attribute. At Col. 1 Ln. 31-38 and Col. 6 Ln. 30-34, *Grover* describes the managing device retrieving attributes of objects and then sending a request for the performance of an operation, such as an object query or object modification, on the retrieved attributes of that object. Unlike the claimed approach, *Grover* has no description or suggestion of sending or receiving a management request comprising proposed values for a managed object in a managed device.

At Col. 3 Ln. 21-35 and Ln. 53-55, *Grover* suggests the generation of test signals, such as those requesting attribute values and modification of attributes, but nonetheless requires the attribute to be retrieved first so the test signals can be generated as a function of the attribute retrieved. *Grover*, at Col. 6 Ln. 19-25, describes testing objects and their attributes, but first obtains information about those object attributes and, as stated in *Grover*, Col. 3, Ln. 21-24, generates the test signals as a function of those retrieved attributes. The method described in *Grover* is substantially different from the claimed approach. The claimed approach provides a way of proposing values of objects to a managed device and determining whether any of the proposed values of a managed object in a managed device are correct.

Finally, at Col. 1 Ln. 41-44, Col. 3 Ln. 8-11, and Col. 6 Ln. 39-45, *Grover* describes the execution of a managing device's request and a failure or error message returned, but the request or test signal is generated as a function of a retrieved attribute of the managed object, unlike the claimed device, where a verification request is simply sent to the managed object in the managed device.

Anticipation requires that a single prior art reference disclose every limitation in a patent claim for the prior art to anticipate the patent claim. *General Elec. Co. v. Nintendo Co., Ltd.*, 179 F.3d 1350, 1356 (Fed.Cir. 1999). As illustrated above, *Grover* does not disclose all the limitations of Claim 1, such as but not limited to, the feature of sending requests to managed devices requesting verification of one or more given proposed values for a managed object in a managed device. The applicant has identified features of the claim that are missing in the reference, and therefore the claim is not anticipated. Thus, Claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over *Grover*. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

B. INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 16, 23, 38, 45, 60, 67, and 82

Claims 16, 23, 38, 45, 60, 67, and 82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by *Grover*.

Claims 16, 23, 38, 45, 60, 67, and 82 include features similar to the features of Claim 1 as discussed above. Thus, Claims 16, 23, 38, 45, 60, 67, and 82 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over *Grover* for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 16, 23, 38, 45, 60, 67, and 82 is respectfully requested.

C. DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-15, 17-22, 24-37, 39-44, 46-59, 61-66, 68-81, and 83-88.

Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9-11, 14, 17-19, 21-22, 24-26, 28, 29, 31-33, 36, 39-41, 43-44, 46-48, 50, 51, 53-55, 58, 61-63, 65-66, 68-70, 72, 73, 75-77, 80, 83-85, 87, and 88 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 5, 27, 49, and 71 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Grover* in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,324,646 B1 to Chen et al. Claims 8, 20, 30, 42, 52, 64, 74, and 86 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Grover* in view of WhitePaper: IronShield Best Practices Hardening Foundry Routers & Switches to Kwan. Claims 12, 13, 34, 35, 56, 57, 78, and 79 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Grover* in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,363,421 B2 to Barker et al. Claims 15, 37, 59, and 81 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Grover* in view of U.S. Pub. No. 20030131096 A1 to Goringe et al.

Each of Claims 2-15, 17-22, 24-37, 39-44, 46-59, 61-66, 68-81, and 83-88 depend on one of the independent Claims 1, 16, 23, 38, 45, 60, 67, and 82, and consequently include each and every feature of the independent base claim. Thus, each of Claims 2-15, 17-22, 24-37, 39-44, 46-59, 61-66, 68-81, and 83-88 are allowable for the reasons given above for Claims 1, 16, 23, 38, 45, 60, 67, and 82. In addition, each of Claims 2-15, 17-22, 24-37, 39-44, 46-59, 61-66, 68-81, and 83-88 introduce one or more additional features that independently render the claim patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified and to expedite the positive resolution of this case, a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-15, 17-22, 24-37, 39-44, 46-59, 61-66, 68-81, and 83-88 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claims 1, 16, 23, 38, 45,

60, 67, and 82. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 2-15, 17-22, 24-37, 39-44, 46-59, 61-66, 68-81, and 83-88 are respectfully requested.

III. CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and the issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that such contact would be helpful in furthering the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: June 29, 2007   /ChristopherJPalermo#42056/
                             Christopher J. Palermo
                             Reg. No. 42,056

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110-1089
Telephone: (408) 414-1080 ext. 202
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION VIA EFS-WEB

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)(1)(ii), I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent & Trademark Office via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §§1.6(1)(4) and 1.8(a)(1)(i)(C) on the date indicated below and before 9:00 PM PST.

Submission date: June 29, 2007   by   /ChristopherJPalermo#42056/